

On Symmetries of Some Massless 2D Field Theories.

Denis BERNARD

Service de Physique Théorique de Saclay ¹

F-91191, Gif-sur-Yvette, France.

We describe few aspects of the quantum symmetries of some massless two-dimensional field theories. We discuss their relations with recent proposals for the factorized scattering theories of the massless PCM_1 and $O(3)_{\theta=\pi}$ sigma models. We use these symmetries to propose massless factorized S-matrices for the $su(2)$ sigma models with topological terms at any level, alias the PCM_k models, and for the $su(2)$ -coset massless flows.

¹ Laboratoire de la Direction des sciences de la matière du Commissariat à l'énergie atomique.

0- Introduction.

Factorized scattering theory [1] usually applies to two-dimensional massive integrable quantum field theory. Recently, A.B. and Al.B. Zamolodchikov proposed scattering theories for some massless models [2]. In the following, we present a re-reading of their results based on the quantum symmetries of these models. Even if they provide further arguments supporting their conjectures, our comments do not form a proof but they could be of some interests in relation with the problem of solving the 2D integrable models from their quantum symmetries [3][4].

1- The PCM_k models.

- *The classical action.* The principal chiral models at level k , PCM_k , are sigmal models with topological terms. The classical action is [5]:

$$S_{PCM_k} = \frac{1}{4\lambda^2} \int d^2x \operatorname{tr} (\partial_\mu g \partial_\mu g^{-1}) + k \Gamma(g) \quad (1)$$

The topological term $\Gamma(g)$ is defined by:

$$\Gamma(g) = \frac{1}{24\pi} \int_B d^3y \epsilon^{ijk} \operatorname{tr} (\bar{g}^{-1} \partial_i \bar{g} \bar{g}^{-1} \partial_j \bar{g} \bar{g}^{-1} \partial_k \bar{g}) \quad (2)$$

where B is a three dimensional space whose boundary ∂B is the two-dimensional space-time and $\bar{g}$ is an extension of g on B . For the quantum theory to be well-defined the parameter k as to be an integer; it is called the level. The classical equations of motion are:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\mu J_\mu^R &= 0 & \text{with} & & J_\mu^R &= g^{-1} \partial_\mu g - \frac{k\lambda^2}{4\pi} \epsilon_{\mu\nu} g^{-1} \partial_\nu g \\ \partial_\mu J_\mu^L &= 0 & \text{with} & & J_\mu^L &= \partial_\mu g g^{-1} + \frac{k\lambda^2}{4\pi} \epsilon_{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu g g^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

They are conservation laws for two left and right currents.

- *The classical integrability.* The PCM_k are classically integrable since they admit a zero curvature representation. Namely, the classical equations of motion are equivalent to the vanishing of the curvature, $[\partial_\mu - A_\mu, \partial_\nu - A_\nu] = 0$, for the following Lax connexion [6][7]:

$$A_\mu = \left(\frac{1 + \frac{k\lambda^2}{4\pi} w}{1 - w^2} \right) (g^{-1} \partial_\mu g + w \epsilon_{\mu\nu} g^{-1} \partial_\nu g) \quad (4)$$

where w is a spectral parameter. Moreover, the form of the Lax connexion immediately implies the existence of an infinite number of non-local conserved currents. There exist

two infinite families of such currents: the first members of each of these families are the left and right currents, $J_\mu^L(x)$ and $J_\mu^R(x)$, whereas the second ones, $\mathcal{J}_\mu^L(x)$ and $\mathcal{J}_\mu^R(x)$, are given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}_\mu^L(x) &= \left(1 - \left(\frac{k\lambda^2}{4\pi}\right)^2\right) \epsilon_{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu g g^{-1} + \frac{1}{2} \left[\int_{\mathcal{C}_x} *J^L, J_\mu^L \right] \\ \mathcal{J}_\mu^R(x) &= \left(1 - \left(\frac{k\lambda^2}{4\pi}\right)^2\right) \epsilon_{\mu\nu} g^{-1} \partial_\nu g + \frac{1}{2} \left[\int_{\mathcal{C}_x} *J^R, J_\mu^R \right]\end{aligned}\tag{5}$$

Here $\mathcal{C}_x$ is a one-dimensional curve ending at the point x . The conservation laws for these currents are simple consequences of the classical equations of motion.

- *The quantum non-local currents.* The currents (5) can be quantized following the approach initialized by Lüscher [8]; they are regularized using a point-splitting procedure. As it was argued in ref. [6], there are no anomalies and the regularized quantum currents are still conserved; therefore the quantum PCM_k models are supposed to be integrable. These non-local currents reflect Yangians symmetries [9]. More precisely, as in ref. [10], the global charges Q^a and $\mathcal{Q}^a$ associated to the currents $J_\mu^{L,a}$ and $\mathcal{J}_\mu^{L,a}$ are identified as the generators of an Yangian quantum algebra $Y(G)$. Similarly, the global charges $\overline{Q}^a$ and $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}^a$ corresponding to the currents $J_\mu^{R,a}$ and $\mathcal{J}_\mu^{R,a}$ also generate an Yangian $Y(G)$. Therefore, the PCM_k models is invariant by $Y_L(G) \times Y_R(G)$.

- *The RG flows.* The one-loop beta function was computed by Witten in ref. [5] in the case where $G = su(N)$:

$$\beta(\lambda, k) = -\frac{\lambda^2(N-2)}{4\pi} \left(1 - \left(\frac{k\lambda^2}{4\pi}\right)^2\right)\tag{6}$$

It indicates a RG fixed-point at $\lambda^2 = \frac{4\pi}{k}$. This point corresponds to the WZW models at level k [5][11]. The RG flows of the PCM_k models can be described as follows. The ultraviolet fixed point is a free conformal field theory with central charge equal to the dimension of the group, $c^{UV} = \dim G$. The UV stress-tensor can be written as :

$$T^{UV}(z) = \frac{1}{2} (i\partial_z \vec{\phi})^2 - \sum_{\alpha>0} \omega_\alpha^\dagger \partial_z \omega_\alpha\tag{7}$$

where $\vec{\phi}$ is a free boson field taking values in the Cartan subalgebra of G and the fields $\omega_\alpha^\dagger$, ω_α , for any positive root α , form a system of spin 1-spin 0 conformal fields. For $k \neq 0$, the infrared fixed point of the PCM_k model is the WZW_k conformal field theory with central

charge $c^{IR} = \frac{k \dim G}{k+h^*}$, h^* is the dual Coxeter number [11]. Using a free field representation of the WZW_k models [12], the infrared stress-tensor can be written as:

$$T^{IR}(z) = \frac{1}{2}(i\partial_z \vec{\phi})^2 - \frac{i}{\sqrt{k+h^*}} \vec{\rho} \cdot \partial_z^2 \vec{\phi} - \sum_{\alpha>0} \omega_\alpha^\dagger \partial_z \omega_\alpha \quad (8)$$

with $\vec{\rho}$ the Weyl vector of G . The net effect of the RG flow on the stress-tensor is the production of the background charge $\vec{\rho}/\sqrt{k+h^*}$ in the IR regime and the screening of degrees of freedom in accordance with the c -theorem². We now restrict ourselves to the case $G = su(2)$.

2- The Zamolodchikov's proposal for the S-matrix of the PCM_1 models.

Recently, A.B. and Al.B. Zamolodchikov proposed [2] factorized scatterings for some integrable massless theories. Their strategy can be summarized as follows. First they introduce a factorizable S-matrix for the IR conformal field theory which acts separately on the left and right sectors. Introducing the symbols $L_\alpha(\theta)$ and $R_\alpha(\theta)$ for the chiral “massless particles” with rapidities θ the scattering theory is then summarized by the following commutation relations [1]:

$$\begin{aligned} L_\alpha(\theta_1) L_{\alpha'}(\theta_2) &= S_{LL}(\theta_1 - \theta_2)_{\alpha\alpha'}^{\beta\beta'} L_{\beta'}(\theta_2) L_{\beta_1}(\theta) \\ R_\alpha(\theta_1) R_{\alpha'}(\theta_2) &= S_{RR}(\theta_1 - \theta_2)_{\alpha\alpha'}^{\beta\beta'} R_{\beta'}(\theta_2) R_{\beta_1}(\theta) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The analytical properties of the S-matrices S_{LL} and S_{RR} are supposed to be the same as for massive scatterings. In particular, besides satisfying the quantum Yang-Baxter equation, these S-matrices are supposed to satisfy the unitary and crossing relations:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{12}(\theta) S_{21}(-\theta) &= 1 \\ S_{12}(i\pi - \theta) &= S_{12}^{cross}(\theta) \equiv C_2 S_{12}^{t_2}(\theta) C_2 \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Here C is the charge conjugation matrix. We have used the standard notation in which the lower indices refer to the spaces on which the operators are acting.

The scattering theory for the massless (but not scale invariant) theory is completed by specifying the scattering between the left and the right particles:

$$L_\alpha(\theta_1) R_{\alpha'}(\theta_2) = S_{LR}(\theta_1 - \theta_2)_{\alpha\alpha'}^{\beta\beta'} R_{\beta'}(\theta_2) L_{\beta_1}(\theta_1) \quad (11)$$

The matrices S_{LR} should satisfy mixed Yang-Baxter equations for the consistency of the mixed scatterings (LLR) or (LRR). As it was argued by Al.B. Zamolodchikov [13], the

² A WZW model can never be the ultraviolet fixed point of a $G \times G$ invariant field theory.

S-matrices S_{LR} are not required to satisfy the unitary and crossing relations separately but only a mixed unitary-crossing relation:

$$S_{12}(\theta) S_{21}^{cross}(\theta + i\pi) = S_{12}(\theta) C_2 S_{21}^{t_2}(\theta + i\pi) C_2 = 1 \quad (12)$$

- *The S-matrix for the WZW_1 models.* The S-matrix for the $su(2)$ WZW model at level one proposed in ref. [2] can be described as follows: the chiral “particles” form $su(2)$ doublets, therefore we have the symbols $L_\alpha(\theta)$ and $R_\alpha(\theta)$ with $\alpha = +$ or $-$. The left-left and the right-right scatterings was proposed to be:

$$S_{LL}(\theta) = S_{RR}(\theta) = S_{Y_{su(2)}}(\theta) \quad (13)$$

with [1] :

$$S_{Y_{su(2)}}(\theta)_{\alpha\beta}^{\alpha'\beta'} = u(\theta) \left(\frac{\theta \delta_\alpha^{\alpha'} \delta_\beta^{\beta'} - i\pi \delta_\alpha^{\beta'} \delta_\beta^{\alpha'}}{\theta - i\pi} \right) \quad (14)$$

$$u(\theta) = \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{[i\pi(2n-2) + \theta][i\pi(2n-1) - \theta]}{[i\pi(2n-2) - \theta][i\pi(2n-1) + \theta]} \right)$$

- *The S-matrix for the PCM_1 models.* Since the IR limit of the PCM_1 model is the WZW_1 model, A.B. and Al.B. Zamolodchikov conjectured that the S-matrix of the PCM_1 models is given by the LL and RR scattering defined in eq. (13) plus a scattering between the left and right sectors. By $su(2)$ invariance, the latter is purely diagonal and they find [2]:

$$S_{LR}(\theta) = T(\theta) = \tanh \left(\frac{\theta}{2} - i\frac{\pi}{4} \right) \quad (15)$$

The function $T(\theta)$ is constrained by the unitary-crossing relation (12): $T(\theta)T(\theta + i\pi) = 1$. In ref. [2], the authors choose the “minimal” solution.

3- Quantum symmetries of the PCM_1 models.

- *Quantum symmetries of the WZW_1 models.* First let us consider the WZW_1 models. It is well-known that the S-matrix (14) is $Y_{su(2)}$ invariant; on-shell the generators of $Y_{su(2)}$ act on the particles with rapidity θ by $Q^a = t^a$ and $\mathcal{Q}^a = i\frac{\theta h^*}{2\pi} t^a$ where t^a form the spin $\frac{1}{2}$ representation of $su(2)$. These $Y_{su(2)}$ symmetries reflect the existence of the non-local currents (5) that we discussed in the previous section. Moreover, as we will show, the $Y_{su(2)}$ algebras can be recovered in the bootstrap approach, or more precisely, they can be reconstructed from the Zamolodchikov exchange algebra (9)³. The generators

³ This construction arises from a joint work with A. Leclair on properties of form factors in two dimensions. It will be further developped elsewhere.

of the quantum algebra appear in the fusion [14] of two spin $\frac{1}{2}$ representations, since these representations are self conjugate. Thus, following F. Smirnov [4], we assume that the OPE of two $L(\theta)$ operators (or two $R(\theta)$) possesses a simple pole if the rapidities differ by $i\pi$, and we introduce two generating matrices $T^R(\theta)$ and $T^L(\theta)$ by:

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\alpha\alpha'}^L(\theta) &= \text{Res}_{\theta-\theta'=i\pi} (L_\alpha(\theta)L_{\alpha'}(\theta')) \\ T_{\alpha\alpha'}^R(\theta) &= \text{Res}_{\theta-\theta'=i\pi} (R_\alpha(\theta)R_{\alpha'}(\theta')) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

A simple computation using eq. (9) reveals that the matrix $T^L(\theta)$ satisfies quadratic commutation relations:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{21}(\theta_2 - \theta_1) T_1^L(\theta_1) S_{21}(\theta_2 - \theta_1 - i\pi) T_2^L(\theta_2) \\ = T_2^L(\theta_2) S_{12}(\theta_1 - \theta_2 - i\pi) T_1^L(\theta_1) S_{12}(\theta_1 - \theta_2) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Here the S-matrix is the $S_{Y_{su(2)}}$ matrix, eq. (13). A similar equation holds for $T^R(\theta)$. The algebra (17) is very similar but not identical to the quantum affine algebra in the presentation formulated in ref. [15]. Furthermore, let us factorize $T^L(\theta)$ as $T^L(\theta) = (t^-(\theta))^{-1} t^+(\theta)$ with $t^+(\theta)$ ($t^-(\theta)$) regular at infinity (at the origin). A consistent set of commutation relations for $t^+(\theta)$ and $t^-(\theta)$ are:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{12}(\theta_1 - \theta_2) t_1^\pm(\theta_1) t_2^\pm(\theta_2) &= t_2^\pm(\theta_2) t_1^\pm(\theta_1) S_{12}(\theta_1 - \theta_2) \\ S_{12}(\theta_1 - \theta_2) t_1^+(\theta_1) t_2^-(\theta_2) &= t_2^-(\theta_2) t_1^+(\theta_1) S_{21}(\theta_2 - \theta_1 - i\pi) \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

The first of these equations is one of the alternative presentation of the Yangian $Y_{su(2)}$, and their set defines an extension of the Yangians. The same relation applies for the right sector. In summary, applying this construction for both chiral sectors, provides a way to reconstruct the $Y_{su(2)} \times Y_{su(2)}$ symmetry of WZW_1 model in the bootstrap approach.

- *Symmetries of the PCM_1 models.* As we argued in section 1, the PCM_1 model is invariant under the algebra $Y_{su(2)} \times Y_{su(2)}$ in the same way as the WZW_1 model possesses this invariance. Therefore, to verify this assertion we have to check that the scattering between the left and right sectors does not spoil the independence between the left and right Yangians. A simple computation indicates that the matrix $T^R(\theta_1)$ and $T^L(\theta_2)$ commute,

$$T_1^L(\theta_1) T_2^R(\theta_2) = T_2^R(\theta_2) T_1^L(\theta_1) \quad (19)$$

provided that the diagonal LR -scattering matrix $T(\theta)$ satisfies the unitary-crossing relation: $T(\theta)T(\theta + i\pi) = 1$. This shows that the PCM_1 are effectively invariant under

$Y_{su(2)} \times Y_{su(2)}$. It also gives another argument supporting the Zamolochikov's S-matrix (13)-(15).

4- Remark on the $O(3)_{\theta=\pi}$ S-matrix.

The $O(3)_\theta$ models are 2D sigma models with target the two-sphere and with a topological term whose coefficient is θ . For $\theta = 0$ the theory is massive, while it has been argued that for $\theta = \pi$ it is massless with IR fixed point the WZW_1 model [16]. The RG flow arrives at the IR fixed point along the direction $J_L^a \bar{J}_R^a$ where J_L^a and $\bar{J}_R^a$ are the left and right currents of the WZW_1 conformal field theory. Thus, the large distance effective action is:

$$S_{O(3)_{\theta=\pi}}^{IR} = S_{WZW_1} + \lambda' \int d^2x J_L^a \bar{J}_R^a \quad (20)$$

The current-current perturbation (20) breaks the $Y_{su(2)} \times Y_{su(2)}$ symmetry of the WZW_1 model but it preserves its diagonal subalgebra. More precisely, perturbatively the diagonal current $J^{diag} = J^L + J^R$ is conserved and curl-free. This implies a conservation law for a non-local current $\mathcal{J}^{diag}$ whose definition is similar to those introduced in eq. (5). However, due to the non-linearity in (5), the non-local current $\mathcal{J}^{diag}$ is not the sum of the $Y_{su(2)}$ currents $\mathcal{J}^L$ and $\mathcal{J}^R$ of the WZW_1 model but,

$$\begin{aligned} J_\mu^{diag} &= J_\mu^L + J_\mu^R \\ \mathcal{J}_\mu^{diag} &= \mathcal{J}_\mu^L + \mathcal{J}_\mu^R + \frac{1}{2} \left[\int_{\mathcal{C}_x} *J^L, J_\mu^R \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[\int_{\mathcal{C}_x} *J^R, J_\mu^L \right] \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Therefore, for the global charges Q_{diag}^a and $\mathcal{Q}_{diag}^a$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{diag}^a &= Q_L^a + Q_R^a \\ \mathcal{Q}_{diag}^a &= \mathcal{Q}_L^a + \mathcal{Q}_R^a + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{abc} Q_L^b Q_R^c \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Eqs. (22) reflect the comultiplication in $Y_{su(2)}$. In other words, the diagonal subalgebra is defined through the comultiplication.

Assuming bindly that these perturbative arguments remain valid non-perturbatively, we may conclude that the massless S-matrix of the $O(3)_{\theta=\pi}$ has to be $Y_{su(2)}^{diag}$ invariant. This constrains the LR-scattering to be proportional to $S_{Y_{su(2)}}$, and thus we get:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{LL}(\theta) &= S_{RR}(\theta) = S_{Y_{su(2)}}(\theta) \\ S_{LR}(\theta) &= iS_{Y_{su(2)}}(\theta) \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

This is exactly the Zamolodchikov's proposal [2]. (We choose the proportionality coefficient in order to recover their result).

5- A proposal for the PCM_k S-matrices.

- *Quantum symmetries of the WZW_k models and their S-matrices.* As we already pointed out, the WZW_k models are $Y_{su(2)} \times Y_{su(2)}$ invariant for any level k . But for $k \geq 2$, the WZW_k model possesses an extra quantum symmetry which has been identified as $\mathcal{U}_q(su(2)) \times \mathcal{U}_q(su(2))$ with $q = -\exp\left(\frac{-i\pi}{k+2}\right)$ (more precisely it is a *RSOS* version of it). The currents generating this symmetry are $\mathcal{J}_k(z)$ and $\overline{\mathcal{J}}_k(\bar{z})$ [17][18]:

$$\mathcal{J}_k(z) = \frac{1}{k+4} (J_{-1}^a \Psi^a)(z) \quad (24)$$

where J_{-1}^a is the (-1) -component of the WZW chiral current and $\Psi^b(z)$ is the chiral primary field taking values in the adjoint representation of $su(2)$. The conformal dimension of this current is $\Delta_k = 1 + \frac{2}{k+2}$. The corresponding charges $Q^{(k)}$ and $\overline{Q}^{(k)}$ have spin $\pm \frac{2}{k+2}$. For $k = 2$, $\mathcal{J}_{k=2}(z)$ is a supersymmetric current and the quantum symmetry simply reduces to a supersymmetry. By abuse of notation, we will refer to this quantum symmetry as a k^{th} fractional supersymmetry.

In order to take into account of all symmetries, we are lead to propose a S-matrix for the chiral LL and RR scattering having a tensor product form. This proposal is also supported by the knowledge of the S-matrix for the Thirring-like massive perturbations of the WZW models [18]. The chiral “massless particles” consist of doublets of kinks; i.e. we have the symbols $L_{ab}^\pm(\theta)$ and $R_{ab}^\pm(\theta)$ with $a, b = 0, \frac{1}{2}, \dots, \frac{k}{2}$, $|a - b| = \frac{1}{2}$ and where the indices $\pm$ refer to the states in the spin $\frac{1}{2}$ representation of $su(2)$. These doublets of kinks are in one-to-one correspondence with the conformal blocks of the chiral WZW primary fields valued in the spin $\frac{1}{2}$ representation. For their scattering we propose:

$$S_{LL}(\theta) = S_{RR}(\theta) = S_{Y_{su(2)}}(\theta) \otimes S_{rsos}^{(k)}(\theta) \quad (25)$$

The $S_{Y_{su(2)}}$ matrix acts only the $\pm su(2)$ indices and its expression is given in eq. (14). The $S_{rsos}^{(k)}$ matrix is the S-matrix of the k^{th} restricted sine-Gordon models [19]. It acts only on the kink indices $a, b, \dots$:

$$L_{ad}^\alpha(\theta) L_{dc}^{\alpha'}(\theta') = \sum_b S_{rsos}^{(k)}(\theta - \theta')_{dc}^{ab} L_{ab}^{\alpha'}(\theta') L_{bc}^\alpha(\theta) \quad (26)$$

with, $[a] = \sin((2a+1)\pi/(k+2))$,

$$S_{rsos}^{(k)}(\theta)_{dc}^{ab} = v(\theta) \left(\frac{[a][c]}{[d][b]} \right)^{\theta/2i\pi} \left(\sinh\left(\frac{i\pi-\theta}{k+2}\right) \delta_{db} + \sinh\left(\frac{\theta}{k+2}\right) \left(\frac{[d][b]}{[a][c]} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{ac} \right) \quad (27)$$

$$v(\theta) = \frac{1}{\sinh(\frac{i\pi-\theta}{k+2})} \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\sinh(\frac{i\pi(2n-2)+\theta}{k+2}) \sinh(\frac{i\pi(2n-1)-\theta}{k+2})}{\sinh(\frac{i\pi(2n-2)-\theta}{k+2}) \sinh(\frac{i\pi(2n-1)+\theta}{k+2})} \right)$$

It satisfies the Yang-Baxter equation and the unitary and crossing relations,

$$\sum_n S_{rsos}^{(k)}(\theta)_{dc}^{an} S_{rsos}^{(k)}(-\theta)_{nc}^{ab} = \delta_{db} \quad (28)$$

$$S_{rsos}^{(k)}(i\pi-\theta)_{dc}^{ab} = S_{rsos}^{(k)}(\theta)_{cb}^{da}$$

By construction, the S-matrix (25) is invariant under the symmetry algebra $(Y_{su(2)} \times \mathcal{U}_q(su(2)))_L \times (Y_{su(2)} \times \mathcal{U}_q(su(2)))_R$ ⁴. The $Y_{su(2)}$ invariance is explicit. The action of the fractional supersymmetric charges $Q^{(k)}$ and $\bar{Q}^{(k)}$ on the kinks under which the S-matrix $S_{rsos}^{(k)}$ is invariant was described in ref. [19].

Besides the arguments based on symmetries, another check for the WZW_k S-matrix (25) is available via the Thermodynamics Bethe Ansatz analysis [21]. In ref. [22], among many other results, Bazahnov and Reshetikhin have derived the TBA equations for the massive models with S-matrix $S_{Y_{su(2)}} \otimes S_{rsos}^{(k)}$. Therefore the UV limits of these TBA equations are those for the massless scatterings (25). Hopefully, these limits were computed in ref. [22]: they find $c = \frac{k \dim G}{k+h^*}$ for the values of the central charges of the UV conformal field theories, as it should be.

- *The S-matrices for the PCM_k models.* The infrared fixed point of the PCM_k model is the WZW_k theory. The RG trajectory arrives at the infrared fixed point along the direction of the field $\mathcal{J}_k \cdot \bar{\mathcal{J}}_k$ [11]. The large distance effective action of the PCM_k model is therefore:

$$S_{PCM_k}^{IR} = S_{WZW_k} + \lambda' \int d^2x \mathcal{J}_k \cdot \bar{\mathcal{J}}_k \quad (29)$$

Since the fractional supersymmetry generated by the currents $\mathcal{J}_k$ and $\bar{\mathcal{J}}_k$ commute with the Yangians, the perturbation (29) preserves the $Y_{su(2)} \times Y_{su(2)}$ symmetry of the WZW_k model, as it should be. However it breaks the $\mathcal{U}_q(su(2)) \times \mathcal{U}_q(su(2))$ symmetry. But, in the

⁴ To reconstruct the WZW models from their quantum symmetry algebra was also proposed in ref. [20], (section 4a, remark 3), but obviously, the Zamolodchikov's approach are much more concrete.

same way as for the $J^a \bar{J}^a$ perturbation discussed in section 4, because it is a current-current perturbation for the quantum algebra, it should preserve the diagonal $\mathcal{U}_q(su(2))$ symmetry. Assuming that these perturbative arguments remain valid non-perturbatively, we may conclude that the quantum symmetry of the PCM_k models is $Y_{su(2)} \times Y_{su(2)} \times \mathcal{U}_q(su(2))_{diag}$.

Therefore, the simplest scattering matrix satisfying all these symmetry properties is:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{LL}(\theta) &= S_{RR}(\theta) = S_{Y_{su(2)}}(\theta) \otimes S_{rsos}^{(k)}(\theta) \\ S_{LR}(\theta) &= T(\theta) \otimes S_{rsos}^{(k)}(\theta) \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

$T(\theta)$ is defined in eq. (15). It satisfies all the mixed factorized equations for the (LLR) or (LRR) scattering since $S_{Y_{su(2)}}$ and $S_{rsos}^{(k)}$ are solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation. The unitary and crossing relations are also fulfilled; in particular, the S-matrix $S_{rsos}^{(k)}$ satisfies the RSOS version of the unitary-crossing relation (12):

$$\sum_n S_{rsos}^{(k)}(\theta)_{dc}^{an} S_{rsos}^{(k)}(i\pi + \theta)_{an}^{dc} = \delta_{db} \quad (31)$$

For $k = 1$, the RSOS factors are absent and we recover the Zamolodchikov's proposal. Notice also that, when reconstructing the quantum symmetry generators as in section 3, the introduction a non-diagonal RSOS scattering (for $k \geq 2$) effectively breaks the left $\times$ right RSOS quantum symmetry, whereas the $Y_{su(2)} \times Y_{su(2)}$ symmetry is preserved since $T(\theta)$ is scalar and satisfies the unitary-crossing relation.

6- A proposal for the $su(2)$ -coset S-matrices.

• *Symmetries of the $su(2)$ -cosets and their S-matrices.* The $su(2)$ -coset models $\frac{su(2)_l \otimes su(2)_k}{su(2)_{l+k}}$ [23], which we denote by $\mathcal{M}(l, k)$, $l > k$, are characterized [17] by a non-local chiral symmetry algebra generated by two currents Φ_l and Φ_k :

$$\Phi_l^{(l;k)} = \left[\frac{(l; adj) \otimes (k; \cdot)}{(l+k; \cdot)} \right] \quad , \quad \Phi_k^{(l;k)} = \left[\frac{(l; \cdot) \otimes (k; adj)}{(l+k; \cdot)} \right] \quad (32)$$

Here the dot denotes the scalar representation. These fields exist only if k or $l \geq 2$. Their conformal dimensions are: $\Delta_l = 1 + \frac{2}{l+2}$ and $\Delta_k = 1 + \frac{2}{k+2}$. The corresponding charges $Q^{(l)}$ and $Q^{(k)}$ have spin $\frac{2}{l+2}$ and $\frac{2}{k+2}$. They generate a fractional supersymmetry in the same way as the currents (24) did. In a Feigin-Fuchs representation of the $su(2)$ cosets [17], the currents (32) differ from the currents (24) only by the radius of compactification of the bosonic field, up to a total derivative.

Once again, the simplest way to take care of both symmetries is to have a S-matrix having a tensor product form. We propose that the chiral “massless particles” are kinks

carrying two couples of indices, one for each fractional supersymmetry: $L_{a_l b_l; a_k b_k}(\theta)$ and $R_{a_l b_l; a_k b_k}(\theta)$, with $a_l, b_l = 0, \frac{1}{2}, \dots, l/2$, $|a_l - b_l| = \frac{1}{2}$ and similarly for a_k, b_k . And for their scattering:

$$S_{LL}(\theta) = S_{RR}(\theta) = S_{rsos}^{(l)}(\theta) \otimes S_{rsos}^{(k)}(\theta) \quad (33)$$

The two factors act separately on the couples of indices as in eq. (26). By construction it is invariant under two fractional supersymmetries generated by charges with spins $\frac{2}{l+2}$ and $\frac{2}{k+2}$.

If $k = 1$, the $\mathcal{M}(l, k = 1)$ models are the minimal conformal theories and the corresponding factor is absent. In the limit $l \rightarrow \infty$ and k fixed, the $su(2)$ -cosets models $\mathcal{M}(l \rightarrow \infty, k)$ become the WZW_k models; in this limit, the S-matrix (33) flows to the WZW_k S-matrix since we have $S_{rsos}^{(l \rightarrow \infty)} = S_{Y_{su(2)}}$.

The work by Bazahnov and Reshetikhin [22] provides a TBA check for the S-matrix (33). Indeed they also derived the TBA equations for the massive theories with S-matrix $S_{rsos}^{(l)} \otimes S_{rsos}^{(k)}$. The ultraviolet limits of these equations are those of the massless models with scattering (33). In these limits, they computed the central charges of the UV conformal field theories and found those of the $su(2)$ cosets.

• *The S-matrices for the $su(2)$ -coset flows.* The $su(2)$ coset flows are RG flows from the $\mathcal{M}(l, k)$ models to the $\mathcal{M}(l - k, k)$ models [24]. The UV fixed point $\mathcal{M}(k, l)$ is perturbed by the relevant field $\left[\frac{(l; \cdot) \otimes (k; \cdot)}{(l+k; adj)} \right]$, and the IR limit approaches from the direction $\left[\frac{(l-k; adj) \otimes (k; \cdot)}{(l; \cdot)} \right]$. The small and large distance effective actions are:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{coset}^{UV} &= S_{\mathcal{M}(l; k)} + \lambda \int d^2x \left[\frac{(l; \cdot) \otimes (k; \cdot)}{(l+k; adj)} \right] \\ S_{coset}^{IR} &= S_{\mathcal{M}(l-k; k)} + \lambda' \int d^2x \left[\frac{(l-k; adj) \otimes (k; \cdot)}{(l; \cdot)} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Both the ultraviolet and the infrared perturbing fields are scalar for the $su(2)$ level k . Neither of them breaks the left and the right k^{th} fractional supersymmetry. Therefore, perturbatively the $su(2)$ coset models are invariant under two independent left and right k^{th} fractional supersymmetry. On the other hand, the infrared perturbing field is not scalar for the $su(2)$ at level $(l - k)$, but it is a current-current perturbations, $\Phi_{l-k}^{(l-k; k)} \overline{\Phi}_{l-k}^{(l-k; k)}$, for the $(l - k)^{th}$ infrared fractional supersymmetry. Therefore it should preserve the diagonal quantum symmetry. Taking this argument for granted non-pertubatively leads to the following simple ansatz for the S-matrix of the $su(2)$ cosets:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{LL}(\theta) &= S_{RR}(\theta) = S_{rsos}^{(l-k)}(\theta) \otimes S_{rsos}^{(k)}(\theta) \\ S_{LR}(\theta) &= S_{rsos}^{(l-k)}(\theta) \otimes T(\theta) \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

It satisfies all the unitary, crossing and factorization relations. In the limit $l \rightarrow \infty$, $(l - k) = n$ fixed, the $su(2)$ massless cosets become the PCM_n models: the S-matrices (35) effectively reduce to the scattering matrix (30). Also in the case $l = 2$, $k = 1$, which corresponds to the flow between the tricritical Ising model to the Ising model, all the matrix element of (35) becomes trivial except for the LR scattering which turn out to be scalar, $S_{LR}(\theta) = T(\theta)$, in agreement with ref. [13].

7- Conclusions.

To support our proposals we only offered cross-arguments and there is obviously a need for more checks. To derive the TBA equations for the massless non-scale invariant scatterings (30) and (35) could be one of the possible way to check them. Another more challenging approach consists in reconstructing the correlation functions for these massless models. In particular, it could be interesting to apply this program to the conformal field theories in order to test the idea that 2D integrable models can be reconstructed from their quantum symmetries.

Acknowledgements: It is a pleasure to thank O. Babelon, A. Leclair and F. Ravanini for discussions.

References

- [1] A.B. and Al.B. Zamolodchikov, *Annals of Physics* 120 (1979) 253.
- [2] A.B. and Al.B. Zamolodchikov, “Massless factorized scattering and sigma-models with topological terms”, preprint ENS-LPS-335-1991.
- [3] D. Bernard and A. Leclair, “Quantum group symmetries and non-local currents in 2D QFT”, preprint 10/90, to appear in *Commun. Math. Phys.*; and “Non-local currents in 2D QFT: an alternative to the QISM”, *Proc. of the “Quantum Groups” conference*, Leningrad, Nov. 1990.
- [4] F. Smirnov, “Dynamical symmetries of massive integrable models”, preprint RIMS-772-838, 1991.
- [5] E. Witten, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 92 (1984) 455;
A.M. Polyakov and P.B. Wiegmann, *Phys. Lett. B* 41 (1984) 223.
- [6] M.C.B. Abdalla, *Phys. Lett.* 152B (1985) 215
- [7] H. deVega, *Phys. Lett.* 87B (1979) 233.
- [8] M. Luscher, *Nucl. Phys.* B135 (1978) 1.
- [9] V.G. Drinfel’d, “Quantum groups”, *Proc. of the ICM*, Berkeley, (1986).
- [10] D. Bernard, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 137 (1991) 191.
- [11] V.G. Knizhnik and A.B. Zamoldchikov, *Nucl. Phys.* B297 (1984) 83.
- [12] M. Wakimoto, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 104 (1986) 605.
- [13] Al.B. Zamolodchikov, *Nucl. Phys.* B358 (1991) 619.
- [14] P.P. Kulish, N.Yu. Reshetikhin and E.K. Sklyanin, *Lett. Math. Phys.* 5 (1981) 393.
- [15] N.Yu. Reshetikhin and M. Semenov-Tian-Shansky, *Lett. Math. Phys.* 19 (1990) 133.
- [16] F.D.M. Haldane, *J. Appl. Phys.* 57 (1985) 3359; I. Affleck, *Les Houches lecture* 1988, Ed. E. Brezin and J. Zinn-Justin, North. Holl. 1990
- [17] D. Kastor, E. Martinec and Z. Qiu, *Phys. Lett.* 200B (1988) 434;
J. Bagger, D. Nemeschansky and S. Yankielowicz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 60 (1988) 389 ;
F. Ravanini, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* A3 (1988) 397.
- [18] D. Bernard and A. Leclair, *Phys. Lett.* 247B (1990) 309.
- [19] A. Leclair, *Phys. Lett.* 320B (1989) 103;
F. Smirnov, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* A4 (1989) 4213;
D. Bernard and A. Leclair, *Nucl. Phys.* B340 (1990) 721.
- [20] D. Bernard, *Cargese lectures* 1991, preprint SPhT-91-124.
- [21] C.N. Yang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 19 (1967) 1312;
Al.B. Zamolodchikov, *Nucl. Phys.* B342 (1990) 695.
- [22] V.V. Bazhanov and N.Yu. Reshetikhin, *Prog. Theor. Phys. Supplement* No 102 (1990) 301;
N.Yu. Reshetikhin, *Harvard preprint* 1990.
- [23] P. Goddard, A. Kent and D. Olive, *Phys. Lett.* 152B (1985) 88.
- [24] C. Crnkovic, G.M. Sotkov and M. Satnishkov, *Phys. Lett.* 226B (1989) 297.